

Message

From: Burke, Thomas [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=39FFC3DD34EA495B9A31E61B778FBBEC-BURKE, THOM]
Sent: 7/5/2016 6:13:25 PM
To: Cogliano, Vincent [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=51f2736376ac4d32bad2fe7cfef2886b-Cogliano, Vincent]
Subject: FW: Senator seeks prioritisation of PFOA under reformed TSCA (ChemicalWatch)

FYI

Thomas A. Burke, PhD, MPH
Deputy Assistant Administrator, ORD
EPA Science Advisor
1300 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Washington, DC 20004

Personal Matters / Ex. 6

From: Deener, Kathleen
Sent: Tuesday, July 05, 2016 10:22 AM
To: Burke, Thomas <Burke.Thomas@epa.gov>; Kavlock, Robert <Kavlock.Robert@epa.gov>; Gwinn, Maureen <gwinn.maureen@epa.gov>
Subject: Senator seeks prioritisation of PFOA under reformed TSCA (ChemicalWatch)

Senator seeks prioritisation of PFOA under reformed TSCA

Federal review sought to understand long-term effects of exposure

By Sylvia Palmer

Chemicalwatch: Global Risk & Regulation News

30 June 2016

<https://chemicalwatch.com/48369/senator-seeks-prioritisation-of-pfoa-under-reformed-tsca>

US Senator Kirsten Gillibrand (D-New York) has urged the EPA to prioritise regulatory assessment of perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA), under the recently reformed TSCA, to determine whether it should be restricted or banned from use, at the federal level.

In a recent letter sent to EPA administrator Gina McCarthy, Ms Gillibrand urged the agency to do so “as soon as possible”, given “very serious concerns that PFOA is potentially linked to tragic health effects, including various types of cancer”.

Ms Gillibrand’s action comes in response to incidents that she says have exposed New Yorkers to PFOA in drinking water, and amid concerns about its effects on public health. According to her letter, blood testing results showed some residents with blood levels of PFOA at 50 or 100 times above national averages.

“A TSCA analysis will help to improve upon the science” and provide constituents “a better understanding of the long-term effects of PFOA exposure”, she said. It will also “ensure that communities are better protected against this chemical”.

PFOA phase down

There have been dramatic reductions in perfluorooctane sulfonate (PFOS) and PFOA use as a result of a voluntary industry commitment to phase-out the substances, by the end of 2015. The EPA proposed a significant new use rule (Snur) for PFOA and PFOA-related chemicals, including as part of articles, to codify the phase-out.

The US National Toxicology Program (NTP) recently prepared a draft monograph on immunotoxicity associated with exposure to PFOA and PFOS, which is out for consultation. A *Federal Register* notice announcing the draft says that despite the phase-out, their persistence and bioaccumulation has resulted in detectable levels in the US population, making them of “of potential human health relevance”.

In May, the EPA established health advisories on PFOA and PFOS, based on the agency's assessment of the latest peer-reviewed science of the chemicals. This will provide drinking water system operators and overseers with current information on related health risks, and help states and local officials take appropriate protective measures for the public.

The agency has said it will “continue to evaluate new evidence as science on health effects of these chemicals evolves”.

PFOA is on a recently developed list of chemicals of mutual concern (CMC), agreed by the US and Canada. It is currently undergoing evaluation by California's Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (Oehha) to determine whether it should be listed under Proposition 65.

TSCA risk evaluation

The EPA's newly released one-year implementation plan for a reformed TSCA indicates that, as mandated by the new law, the agency will initiate risk evaluations of a published list of ten workplan chemicals, within the next six months. The agency has yet to disclose what those ten chemicals are.

Liz Bowman, director of issue and advocacy communications at the American Chemistry Council (ACC), said that, under the new law, “EPA will establish a transparent, risk-based prioritisation process to identify high and low priority chemicals that considers a chemical's inherent hazards; uses; typical exposure to people, including vulnerable groups, and the environment; proximity to drinking water sources and other relevant information.”

“A thorough risk evaluation will be conducted by the agency on any chemical designated as 'high-priority',” Ms Bowman added.

